P16

190 .

(Municipal)

File No. 124 F-97-8

Serial Nos. 1-6

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1–6

major ~~Part~~ B. for 97-8

SUBJECT.

Complaint of Lingama regarding certain sites in the western extension of the Bangalore city

1. 201 d 29.3.98, from the President Bangalore city municipality. Submits a copy of the notice issued by Mr Narasimhaiyengar advocate on behalf of Lingama and solicits orders in the matter of the alternate request made either to be granted other suitable sites or to be paid a compensation of Rs 2000

G. R. S. 56

Memo

The Bangalore City Improvement papers are generally dealt with in the General and Rev: Departts: - Only some papers such as the acquisition of lands were dealt in the Local Boards Branch.

1. Pro No 8119-21 Dis 1631 Dy 17th January 1898 in dF 47 97 was ordered by the Govt: Secy: to be issued from the General or Financial Branch.

2. Letter No 23 Dy 18.8.00 from the Presidt: Bangalore City Municipality was transferred to Genl: Branch with the following memo noted on the letter

Transferred to the

the General Branch ——
as the payment has to
be made from the
City Improvement Fund.

(Init:) V. I
Assistt: Secy:

This was in turn trans-
ferred to the Revenue
Branch who put up
a memo and a draft
(Docket No $\frac{2796}{H:267}$ dy 25.9.01)

3. Letter No 305
6.9.01 from Govt: Advo-
cate submitting a Bill
for Rs 464-2-6 for de-
fending a suit in Con-
nection with certain
land in the City
Improvement was re-
ceived in the Local
Boards Branch and
transferred to Rev: Br
for disposal on 20-9-01

L.

(3)

4. Letter No 43 Dy 9.7.00 from the Dy: Comr: Bangalore requesting sanction to a sum of Rs 50,000 for the City Improvement was transferred to Rev: Branch Dy. F. No 18-98 in which that No: was issued is said to be misaid.

Following the above precedents this has to be disposed of in the Rev or Genl: Branch.

A memo for orders is herewith submitted

The delay in submitting this paper is due to my absence on Privilege Leave and files containing precedents having been recently recd: from Records.

Clk 3/11/01

The delay is very unsatisfactory The H.D Clerk ought to have brought this to my notice when he went on leave

(4)

the Dy Clerk should have attached to these papers. I shall note the delay to enquire of him.

No mention is made in the office note of the precedents herein referred to. This should have been noted.

The file should at once be sent to the Rev Branch

HB

6/12/1901

Submitted to the Secretary -

The facts of the case are as stated in the accompanying note put up by the L.Bds Branch.

Memo for order.

Land marked as sites nos 1080, 1081, & 1082 and sold by the City Impt: Committee in 1893 to Linganna was found to be in the possession & holding of Chokkalinga Mudaliar.

The Resident of the Bangr City Municipal Commr recommended to Govt that the amount (Rs200) paid by Linganna be refunded

The refund was sanctioned by Govt in the Genl Mis: Dept.

(5)

The party refuses to take back the amount he claims by his sets or damages to the Extent of Rs 2000/.

The Resident & the City Municipal Commission solicits orders in the matter. The matter is pending since March 1898.

The ~~reference~~ papers were received in the Rev Dept under the secs. with the opinion that the matter was one to be dealt with in the CBVS. This was ~~to~~ on 16.7.01.

The secs was pleased to say —

Why shd the Dept: change now? It may go on as hitherto in the CBVS. unless sufficient reason is shewn. By 10.8.01.

With the above memo the papers came again to the Rev Dept. on 6.12.01

The point in issue is

should the reference
made by the Resort
as regards Longmans
representation should
be disposed of -
It is reported that
there are no other
sites that can be given
then, there remains
the question of
Damages -

This question arises
upon the action
taken by the Resort
City Municipal
Commission
He solicits orders
in his Capacity of
Resort Municipal
Commission -

In paras 5 & 6
of the Govt order of 1895,
the Whole of the
Extensions - Chamrajpet
& Northern Extensions
were handed over
to the Municipality -
The Board requested
to bring them under
Municipal Manage-
ment & taxation -
The land does
not

which have
been required
by the late Enclosure
Commissioners.

Now is it proposed
to require now for
the purpose of
paying it back
to Landowners
who should claim
it - where
should the Common
Salem money
come from?

Originally
advances were
sanctioned from
the Provincial Funds
for the purposes
of the Enclosures.
The Commissioners
required £9. the
the advance
account before
30th Septr 1795.

(8)

Yet a memo
for Mr L B B
Submit MCD
The Secretary.
JR
7/12/21

It is a pity that so much time and talent should be wasted on the questions who ought to be in office. As I said once to Mr Lloyd George, I believe it would have come to me if a re-transfer were wanted. Does Mr Conway get more for me than of the Civil? If so, it should be treated as Civil.

Another test is, was the sum of 200 credited to Mds or Provl funds? Please find this out.

14/12

JR

To L.B.B.

Submitted. The sum of Rs 200 was credited to the City Improvement Funds (Provincial).

Rahi ... Bldg Dal

Reference required
DR 25/3/98
Read 30/3.

8475 : 97-98
29/3/98.

From

The President,
Bangalore City Municipality.

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore GB Rly Dpts.

Dated 28th March 98.

Despatched

Received

General No. 201
No.

Enclosure No. 1

Submitting copy of notice issued by Mr. S. Narasimha Iyengar, Advocate on behalf of K Kingalmah and Asking orders in the matter of the alternate request made either to be granted other suitable sites or to be paid compensation of Rs 2000/-.

We are the requisite further investigation. Call for all the papers relating to the Grant of these sites to Lingamma by the City Improvements Committee & the Court of Law (Chamarajpet Magistrate) which was allowed by Mr Leonard.

30/3/98

Put up on 31/3.

Put up

12 of 98

1868
29.3.98

The above noted papers received in the General Branch, indexed & from which reference is obtained and submitted for orders.

29/3/98
30/3/98

(8)

Yet a memo
for Mr L B D
Submitted
the Secretary.
H
7/12/21

It is a fact that so much time and talent should be wasted on the question who did what when in office. As I said when transferred this to the L.L.B., I believe it should have come to me if a re transfer was contemplated. Does not Kierans get more from the Govt? If so, it should be treated as Govt

Another test is, was the sum of 200 credited to Mrs or Prov. funds? Please find this out.

11/12

H.H.

To L.B.D

Submitted. The sum of $200 was credited to the City Improvement Trust Funds (Provincial)
Refund 11 Bills Paid

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,

No. 201
Encl 1

City Bangalore, 28th March 1898

From

The President, Municipal Commission,

Bangalore City.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments,

Bangalore.

SIR,

In Submitting herewith copy of notice dated 11th March 1898 issued by Mr: S. Narasimha Iyengar, — Advocate, on behalf of his client R. Lingannah, I have the honour to state that Lingannah was granted by the late City Improvement Committee three bungalow Sites, nos: 1080 1081, and 1082 for Rupees 200 in Chamarajendrapett. Some time after, Mr: Chockalingam Mudaliar

Set up his claim to these sites and began to build on them. I inspected the Sites on the representation of Lingannah and found Mr. Chockalingam Modliar's claim to be valid. Probably the late City Improvement Committee did not know, while allotting sites in this extension, that the land in question belonged to Mr Chockalingam Modliar. As Lingannah had paid for the Sites and was entitled to a refund of the money, I recommended the refund which was also Sanctioned by Government in Proceedings No. $\frac{4200-1}{\text{Mis } 799}$ dated 8th October 1897. Lingannah now declines to receive back his money, viz, Rupees 200/- and

and insists upon three other sites being granted to him, or payment of Rupees 2000/- as an alternative. I beg to Submit that no Sites are available to be granted to him. I Solicit the favour of early orders in the matter.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

T. T. Cavanagh
PRESIDENT, MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
BANGALORE, CITY.

Hon'ble,

The Office of Mr. S Narasimha
Iyengar Advocate, Julian
Pete. Bangalore.

To.

The President
Municipal Commissioner
Bangalore City—

Mr. R. Linganna has put in our hands a cheque on the Bangalore District Treasury for Rupees 200/— being a refund of the purchase money paid by him for three Sites nos. 1080, 1081 and 1082 in Chamarajpet and says that they were sold to him avowedly on the understanding that they were the Municipal property, that the sale was then complete, and that he has been in possession and

enjoyment of them since then as
owner. He instructs us to inform
you that he is not now prepared
to accept a refund but would accept
in exchange three other Silos Situated
in convenient localities equal in
extent to those sold to him, within
the City municipal limits. He further
instructs that the current market
value of the property together with
all damages incurred by him in
this matter amounts to Rupees 2000/-
and that he is entitled of right
to claim the same from you as
Compensation in case the Sale is
Cancelled. He instructs us to
inform you that he leaves you
the option of electing either of the

two

two ——————— Said alternatives and that in case his claims are not satisfied within 15 days from this date legal steps will be taken against you as he may be best advised in this matter.

I remain
Sir
Yours faithfully
(Sgnd) S. Narasimha Iyengar
Advocate.

Dated 11th March 1898.

"Copy"

T. Leonard

PRESIDENT, MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
BANGALORE, CITY.

Ency

13)

189

From

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Depts.

12862 ?

To

The President of the Bangalore
City Mtg

Dated 6/4/98

Despatched

Received

General No. 12762

L. F. 116-95

Enclosure No.

His letter No 2019 28 March
1898

Adverting to the above
has the Honor to request that
he will be so good as
to submit all the papers
relating (1) to the grant
of the sites referred to, in
the letter to City annals
by the City Improvement
Comte & (2) to the claim
of Mr. Chokkalinga Mudt,
which was also
Mr Leonard in Boy[illegible]

Enclosure to G.O.

Engineer's report

No. 157 & 26.4.90 (Sl. No. 11)

The land in question is survey No. 32 of Guttahalli village, and is included in Govindaraja Mudaliyar's patta. It is the portion left after acquiring the required extent of land for the 5th Main Road. It must therefore be ascertained in the Municipal office whether it belongs to the Board or is under the occupancy of any private individual. From inspection of the site and from what has been stated by the Shanbhog Ranjappa the land seems, however, to belong to Chokkalingam Mudr

---

Engineer's report No. 157 & 25.7.1890 (Sl No. 13) :—

"From inspection of

like the land seems to belong to Chokkalinga Gowda, who is stated to have sunk a well on it".

---

iii Report of the Tahsildar, Bangalore Taluk, no. H.S.D. 22.8.98 (Sl. no. 15) :—

The land under contention is a portion of the Survey no. 32 of Guttahalli and is stated to be under the occupancy of Govindaraj Gowda. Survey no. 32 comprises -

A.	Gts.	
2 -	20	under the occupancy of Govindaraj Gowda
3 -	35	——— do ——— Narasammal
4 -	24	——— do ——— Naranappal
10 -	39.	

It has been noted in the khetwar account that as the portions of the Survey no. belonging to the said Narasammal and Naranappal were acquired for city improvement, they have been brought under the

head "Decrease of assessment"
no such remark has been
entered in the accounts against
the portion of the survey no
under the occupancy of Gurunath
Raja Dhondurjan

× × ×

9/5/12

papers connected with the City Improvement are being dealt with.

Yes. Send by urgent 8/7/01

12/7/1901

L. F. Branch

It is the Revenue Branch & not the Gl: Branch that deals with such papers; please, therefore have this transfer to that Deptt.

MK 12/7

16/7/01

Submitted to the Secretary - Please see last para of the Memo dt 5th inst. Work between the Dewan & the Councillors? 20.3.01

The appeal & the matter connected with the Extension I am such it should in my humble opinion be dealt with by the LBBr.

16/7/01

Why shd the Deptt change now? It may go on as hitherto in the L&B unless sufficient reasons are shown.

18/7

15473 5-7-01 1898-99.

From THE PRESIDENT, Bangalore City Municipality.

To THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE, General and Revenue Departments, BANGALORE.

Dated 29th June 1901.

Despatched

Received

General No. 2 }
No. }

Enclosure No. 1.

Secretary's Docket No 12962 ZF 116-95 dated the 6th April 1898 requesting to submit all the papers relating to the grant of sites to Lingayats by the City Improvement Committee

Submitting the file of papers referred to in the above as requested

L 24/7

8/7/01

Transferred

General Branch

Office of the Municipal Commission

City, Bang[illegible] 17 January 1[illegible]

No 348
File
From

THE PRESIDENT,

Municipal Commission

BANGALORE

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Department

BANGALORE

Sir,

I do solicit for in your Memorandum
No 17762, dated the 8th August 1911,
Z.F. 116-95
I have the honour to submit here-
-with the proposal relative to the
grant of site to accompanied by
the City Improvement Committee
memo (7) to the Chairman of the Bangalore Municipality

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient
servant

[illegible]

[illegible]

Bangalore ?

126 of 99-8

To

The President

Bangalore City Mty

This letter is in 348 dated

29th June 1901 in regard to

the claim of Lingamma for

3 sites or compensation of

2000 in lieu of these site

Nos 1080, 1081 and 1082 granted

to him by the late City

Improvement Committee in

the 5th Main road, Chamarajpet

pete.

2d Reg 15 Rev. 1016-

11067 / 1901 - 24/1/02

Ld. 116-98

Time file of 18 papers

In returning the

papers received with the

above, has the honour to

request that the President

will be good enough to

the enclosed records

relevant ~~to information~~ to the

of the late Improvement Committee,

~~forthcoming~~ ~~from~~ ~~to the~~

to enable this Office

~~Govt Accts Dept~~ to trace

the origin of the ~~account~~ entry

(16)

which led the ~~late~~ Improvement Committee to allot into sites a piece of land which had not been acquired by Government and to dispose of the same to Lingamma for Rs 200. The President is also requested to state specify between the period of Lingamma's petition and the issue of the cheque and to state whether there was any condition about when granting the site building within a particular period ~~when granting~~ and if so whether that condition has been fulfilled and if not ~~the site~~, why Lingamma delayed the erection of on the sites a building for 3 years and whether he did not forfeit his right to any damages thereby.

W.B. O

WB 30/12/1901
For Secy

[Drafted as ~~Dft~~ per Secy's order

Dft 30/12/01

Only the lines within brackets need be omitted as the following information is available.

(1) Lingamma applied for these sites on 5/7/93

(2) Sites were granted on 7/7/93

(3) Lingamma's petition to President asking him to prevent Chowkalingo Moodr from erecting a building } 1/6 1/6

(4) Date of Reference Petition's letter 1897

Let this be ~~entered~~ Dft.
30/12

A.S.C. Dft 31/1/02
Mr dates are correctly given Mad 1/1/02

(17)

Minute

12/4/95

5th

To

The Government Advocate

R. C. 1017

11068

C.F.116-95

4/1/62

Sir,

I have the honor to state that the late Improvement Committee sold 3 Bungalow sites Nos 1080, 1081 and 1082 in 5th Main Road, Chamarajendrapete to one R. Linganna for Rs 200 and received the values thereof in 1893, nearly from the date of sale on three years ~~afterwards~~, the a year after the committee ceased to exist, the purchaser Linganna complained to the Municipal President that one Chelvka Linga Moodeliar had been laying foundation in the said land and asked the former to issue the necessary instructions &

Minuted that the operations of the committee were closed as per ~~in favour~~ Pro No 24999-25003 L.982-92 of 27.6.95.

the latter to stop the
construction of the buildings.

2. After inspection of the spot
and reference to the records
in the Taluk office it
was ascertained that the
claim of Mr. Chokkalinga
Moodelliar was valid and
the President proposed
and Government sanctioned
the refund of Rs 200 to
Linganna, who declines
to accept the amount
but claims, through his Advocate Mr Eswarasamiengar,
the grant to him of
three other sites situated
in convenient localities
equal in extent to those
sold to him within the
City municipal limits on
payment of the current
market values of the property
together

Thereupon ~~and~~ that the sale ~~of the site which had not been~~ ~~accepted~~ by the Special Improvement Committee of the site which had not been acquired was not Correct.

(13)

together with all damages
incurred by them in the
matter amounting to Rs 2000
as compensation in case
the sale is cancelled.

I am therefore to
request that you will be
so good as to state whether
under the foregoing circum
stances the applicants'
claim for more than
is admissible or whether it
Rs 200 may be rejected.

I have &c

WB 30/11/1907
For Secy
Dy J 30/11/

To